

In the office action, claims 1-44 stand rejected as being anticipated in view of the patent to Smithwick et al. For the reasons set forth below, it is respectfully urged that the present invention is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the teachings of the Smithwick et al. patent.

First, the present invention is aimed totally at a trim stripper for a rotary cutting die that cuts corrugated board. It is important to appreciate that the present invention deals with cutting and removing a trim edge from a blank corrugated board being fed into the die. That is, the present invention deals with taking a blank corrugated board and trimming one or more of the outer edges so as to produce what is referred to as the product board. That is, the blank corrugated board is trimmed around outer portions so as to leave the product board. The product board is then internally cut, creased and scored to form the corrugated board product that becomes the corrugated container, for example.

The prior art cited by the patent office, the Smithwick patent, does not in any way relate to cutting or stripping trim from the incoming blank corrugated board sheet. Indeed, the Smithwick patent does not even show any trim strippers. The Smithwick patent is aimed at ejecting cut scrap from the product board itself. Note in the Smithwick patent, where the scrap ejector 10 is always confined within the inside of the trim cutting blades 112. Essentially, in operating on the corrugated product itself, in some cases, it is necessary to cut holes or slots in the product itself. The scrap ejector 10 in Smithwick et al. is what ejects the corrugated board out from the holes in the product. The

Smithwick et al. scrap ejector shown in figure 3 and indicated by the numeral 10, has nothing whatsoever to do with trimming and stripping trim pieces from the blank corrugated board. Thus, in the claims, the word trim means the material cut from the outside of the blank and not material cut internally from the product itself.

In an attempt to more clearly define the present invention, independent claims 1, 21 and 28 have been amended herein. These amended claims clearly distinguish over the teachings of the Smithwick et al. patent. The particular scrap ejectors of Smithwick et al. that are disposed interiorly of the trim blade 112 cannot under any circumstances be deemed to meet the terms of the claims calling for a trim stripper. This is because the trim stripper of the present invention deals with stripping the cut trim pieces disposed outside of the trim blades. Properly interpreted, all of the claims pending herein define over the prior art.

Respectfully submitted,

RHODES, COATS & BENNETT, L.L.P  
Attorneys for Applicant

By:



Larry L. Coats  
Registration No. 25,620

Telephone: (919) 854-1844



**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS DOCUMENT IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE AS FIRST CLASS MAIL, POSTAGE PREPAID, IN AN ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO: **COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231.**

SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_